CANDOUR *The British Views-Letter*

To defend national sovereignty against the menace of international finance

Vol 39, No 1. *Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper* January, 1988.

IN SORROW AND IN ANGER

(or No Longer Sovereign - Just A Social Worker!)

MANY of Her Majesty's subjects must be increasingly alarmed as the text of successive Christmas broadcasts exhibits increasing bias against her own people.

The Queen is still Queen of England. When, in 1953, she took the Coronation Oath she promised to uphold the laws and customs of this land. In those still heady days of Empire and the Dominions the common link was the allegiance to and protection of the Crown. Without the Crown there was no common citizenship.

One-Way Allegiance

In every Christmas broadcast she makes much of the "Commonwealth", yet to all appearances none of the former colonies which severed their allegiance to the Crown and took so-called "independence", and have subsequently become one-party dictatorships, can possibly satisfy the moral tenets required for membership of any such association endorsed by the constitutional monarch of Great Britain - or so one would think. Why, then, her apparent willingness to continue her current role, thus conferring acceptability upon these dictatorships and so implying that there is no essential difference between our system and theirs? Ought we not to start to press for her withdrawal from this role, and courteously ask her to explain her position, for no other approach will even be considered by her.

Moreover, once the colonies' links and allegiance to the Crown were "voluntarily" severed, she - and thus we - ceased to have any responsibility for them. That is what "independence" normally means.

But her responsibility to us remains in force because of her Coronation Oath, yet her broadcasts and her actions - both in relation to abdicating her sovereignty to the E.E.C. and to mass immigration - indicate her affinity with or subordination to (along with our politicians) the Marxist, multi-racial, international New World Order, and estrangement from her own people. How has this come about? Has she been "got at" by unscrupulous advisers or co-erced into co-operation by dire consequences for the nation if she refuses? Or has she just lost her way in the general confusion that the media makes of world events? Is she just making the best of a situation she feels she cannot change or is she wholeheartedly for it anyway? Perhaps readers would like to write to her on these lines and tell us the result?

Her Majesty cannot be oblivious to the damage being done both by the E.E.C. and multi-racialism since there is more and more news of it in the press. Please ask these questions in your local newspaper and on your local 'phone-in programmes.

What saddens, angers and hopefully alarms us is the realisation that, as the anti-Marketeers found out, our ancient right to petition the monarch against unwelcome government activity is merely diverted back to the offending government. Thus our final avenue of appeal to the Throne is perhaps lost for ever unless we determine rigorously to regain it. That should not depend on the present incumbent - it is a right! So since she has declared herself a multi-racialist and anti-nationalist, and since a normal platform upon which to oppose this is denied us, we have no option but to use all possible avenues to make our voices heard. Thankfully more of us are speaking out.

As a result of this abdication of her constitutional responsibilities both in Britain and overseas, we are subjected to two kinds of migration: firstly, the "refugees" fleeing the chaos occasioned in their own lands by the premature and hasty removal of their imperial protectors; secondly, many of the more acquisitive former subjects, encouraged and aided by subversive elements within our governments, come here to carve out a territory of their own, with laws and customs of their own, to the detriment of the native British.

The Queen's hard-pressed subjects are entitled to ask, and must demand to know through the medium of their choice, how is it that our "constitutional monarch" can abrogate her sovereignty with impunity? No one has absolved her from her duty to us according to her oath, yet she violates it every day that immigrants continue to "swamp" (Maggie's term, remember!) our schools and cities with their alien customs, and every moment that we are subjected to the dictates of the E.E.C.

If she is unable or unwilling herself to rectify these outrages, then we must recognise that she is not our sovereign and protector at all, and that we are at the mercy of unscrupulous governments just as long, and only as long, as we continue to support them and their knavish "democracy". In such a situation we can express our sorrow and anger without fear of lese-majeste. We must speak out, and perhaps this article will be of assistance to you in doing so.

A.K. CHESTERTON TRUST

WE need a regular income to help us maintain stability in Candour's finances and enable us to sponsor activities designed to advance the ideas of our founder. Otherwise, we shall be engaged in what Mrs Cecil Chesterton called "noble work with inadequate resources"! Therefore, please send us whatever amount you can spare and address it to: The A.K. Chesterton Trust, Forest House, Liss Forest, Hampshire GU33 7DD.

ESSENTIAL READING

THE HISTORY OF WORLD REVOLUTION by the Duke of Northumberland (1931). Claims the adoption of democracy is fatal to good government, law and order and religion.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA: THE NAKED TRUTH ABOUT THE WORLD WAR PLOT by George Lane-Fox Pitt-Rivers (1938). Looks behind the facade of the Czech crisis at the ill-treatment of the Sudeten German population.

Price £1 each (U.K. only). Cheques payable to CANDOUR RESEARCH DEPT.

THE MADNESS OF CROWDS

by NOEL HUNT

IN 1959 one J.P. Chaplin wrote a book which he titled **Rumour, Fear and the Madness of Crowds.** It records some of the more notable examples of mass hysteria. Chaplin remarks: "To delve into mass hysteria is to encounter the strange, the bizarre, the incredible. The almost unbelievable outbreaks of mass madness are far stronger than anything deliberately contrived by man's fertile imagination. Were he to witness today's incredible mass euphoria and the general delight with which the West has hailed the U.S.-U.S.S.R. missile treaty, Chaplin would undoubtedly wish to add another and even more incredible chapter to his book.

Without a single shred of evidence to support its belief, in the teeth of the evidence of history, with no reason at all to believe a single word the Russians say - indeed, with every reason to disbelieve the Russians - the West has apparently decided that the Russian bear has suddenly become a lamb, has changed its nature and purpose. The belief that the U.S.S.R. intends to observe the terms of the latest treaty is contrary to all that history tells us, contrary to our own experience with the Russians, and in conflict with Marxist-Leninist dogma. It is utterly illogical. It is, in fact, "the madness of crowds" noted by Chaplin. Ecstatic commentators tell us that such is "Gorby's" popularity in the West today that if he ran for office he would be elected in a landslide. We learn, too, that opinion polls show "the man in the street" as being three to one in favour of the treaty. If true, it is hard to imagine a more damning indictment of the folly of universal suffrage or to think of a better argument for the disenfranchisement of about a third of the voting population!

A GLANCE AT RUSSIAN HISTORY

There is no evidence at all that the Politburo has abandoned its expressed intention to rule the world. All that has happened is that the U.S.S.R. has signed a treaty about missile reduction. Since their long-term purpose - world rule - remains unchanged, this can mean only that the Politburo wants a breathing space to deal with internal problems. It means, too, that the Russians are confident that they have found a way of cheating on missile reduction without being found out. Those who feel and say so loudly and so often that the Politburo is mellowing, and that we should trust them, would benefit from a quick glance at Russian history.

History shows that Russia, whether ruled by the Tsars or the Politburo, has always been an aggressive and imperialistic power. For instance, in the 9th and 10th centuries Russia fought five wars against Byzantium. During the 13th and 14th centuries the Russians fought 41 wars against Lithuania, 30 wars against the German Baltic States and 44 wars against Sweden, Bulgaria and other smaller states. Wars against her neighbours continued throughout the 17th century. In the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries eight wars were fought against the Poles, and nine wars against Sweden between 1554 and 1800. Peter the Great waged two wars against China. In the 17th century Russia fought the Turks nine times. Persia was the enemy in three Russian wars between 1722 and 1828. Catherine fought a war with India in 1796; another campaign was begun

by her successor, Paul, in 1801. In 1904 Russia provoked Japan into war. Finland was attacked in 1941. Since 1945 we have seen an aggressive Russia swallow nearly half of Europe and establish her control over most of Africa. The pattern of aggression and imperialism is constant throughout Russian history. Yet we are told, and quite obviously the West desperately wants to believe, that this ruthlessly aggressive power has suddenly changed its nature and its policy. The evidence of history says that the Russians have not changed. But, chant the deluded idiots of the West, Russia has signed a binding treaty.

As a sobering counter-blast to such suicidal idiocy, we might consider the 1959 report of the Committee of the Judiciary of the U.S. Senate. This report says, inter alia, "The staff found that in the 38 short years since the Soviet Union came into existence its government had broken its word to virtually every country to which it ever gave a signed promise. It signed treaties of non-aggression with neighbouring states, and then absorbed those states. It signed promises to refrain from revolutionary activity inside the countries with which it sought "friendship", and then cynically broke those promises....It broke the promises it made to Western nations during meetings at the summit in Teheran and Yalta....It keeps no international promises at all unless doing so is clearly advantageous to the Soviet Union." Yet suddenly we are assured, once more, that the Soviets have changed, that this time they really want peace. It is truly said that those whom the gods wish to destroy they first make mad.

THE DUPLICITY OF COMMUNISM

Those who wish to belive that the U.S.S.R. will scrupulously observe the terms of the latest treaty might find it interesting to study some of the fundamental tenets of Marxism-Leninism. Not a word of these has been repudiated either by Gorbachev or the Politburo. They control Russian dealings with other countries as they have always done. In his book **The State and Revolution** Lenin laid down that "the strictest loyalty to the idea of Communism must be combined with the ability to make all necessary practical compromises, to 'tack', to make agreements, zig zags, retreats and so forth in order to accelerate the coming into power". Lenin also laid down that " promises are like pie-crusts, made to be broken. Truth is a weapon in the class-war. Any statement that advances Communism is true."

If further evidence is needed, we might consult Stalin, who once said: "A diplomat's words must have no relation to action - otherwise what kind of diplomacy is it? Words are one thing, actions another. Good words are a mask for the concealment of bad deeds. Sincere diplomacy is no more possible than dry water or iron wood." These fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism are binding on Gorbachev and the Politburo. Certainly neither has repudiated a word of them. Yet in the face of such evidence the West deludes itself into believing that this time the Soviets will abide by their promises.

It is difficult to blame the Russians for their scarcely veiled contempt for the abject West. They know well that their previous violations of treaties have gone unpunished by the West. They know too that the media and the politicians of the west have kept the facts from their peoples. For example, the Soviets signed the SALT 1, SALT 2, ABM and anti-biological warfare treaties. They have breached them all, and

the leaders of the West know it. Suddenly we must believe that this time the Politburo will keep a promise. It passes belief. Gorbachev has admitted, for the first time, that the Soviets broke the ABM treaty by building the Krasnoyansk radar station. He also admitted what the West has long known, but pretended that it did not: that the Soviets are hard at work on their own version of "Star Wars". In fact, all that has happened is that by signing a treaty which he has no intention of observing Gorbachev has gained time. There is not the slightest reason to think that the Politburo will pay any more heed to the provisions of the latest treaty than they have to any of the others they have signed.

Admitting publicly for the first time what the West has long known but preferred not to notice, "Gorby" said in an interview that while the Russians had their own version of a space defence system, they had in fact no intention of deploying it. He added, with matchless effrontery, "We will not deploy S.D.I., and we will call upon the U.S. to act accordingly." People in the West take this blatant nonsense seriously, while looking with tolerant pity on anyone believing in the Easter Bunny or Tooth Fairy! When the most perfidious and perjured regime the world has ever known utters such bare-faced nonsense, millions of what Lenin so rightly called "useful idiots" throughout the West all unite in urging us to believe it. The madness of crowds...

It seems certain that no matter what evidence of Russian perfidy is adduced, the West will still refuse to believe it or will ignore it. They have always done so in the past, and will again if they can. The folly and madness of the Western peoples, their obstinate refusal to see what they prefer not to see, can have only one result: another Russian triumph, another Western defeat. The result of such folly was spelt out clearly many years ago by Heinrich Heine, when in 1842 he wrote: "I advise all our grandchildren to come into the world with very thick hides: for the future reeks of Russian knouts, blood, devilry and copious thrashings."

[Agreed! Nevertheless, we should not fall into the trap of thinking solely in terms of Moscow when considering the nature of the enemy which seeks to enslave us. The regime in the Kremlin was created by the secret government of the U.S.A., and that New York power-elite has nurtured "Russian" Communism from 1917 to the present day - Editor.]

BEWARE OF THE SMILE ON THE TIGER'S FACE

"WHILST everybody welcomes a reduction in nuclear weapons, let us not be carried away by the prevalent euphoria about the signing of the INF agreement by America and Russia. It is more to the advantage of the Soviet Union than the West. First of all it covers only 8% at the most of nuclear weapons. The USSR will retain its tremendous conventional superiority and its near monopoly in chemical weapons for the foreseeable future. It still holds Eastern Europe in its iron grip and shows no sign of ending its occupation of Afghanistan. It is still the enemy of all forms of religious beliefs. A year ago in Tashkent, Gorbachev spoke of the importance of stepping up atheist propaganda. Despite his affability and that of his wife Raisa, beware of the smile on the face of the tiger. To quote the famous line from Vergil's **Aeneid**: "Timeo danaos et dona ferentes."

- Robert Huxtable in the **Epping Forest Extra** (16/12/87)

MISSILE STOP

Orders were standing for bull quite non-stop,
Coal to be whitewashed, the runways to mop;
Each blade of grass to be given the comb,
Windsock fresh-laundered at this aerodrome.

The tarmac was treated to carpet, red
To cushion the feet of the Soviet head;
Along the Axminster airmen to flit
Hand-picking and plucking the offending grit.

British P.M. and Right Hon. entourage
Wait at Brize Norton to greet personage,
Royal Air Force all a-glitter and glow
With rifles and drums and much bright brass to blow.

The canteen must serve - ingloriously
Halfway-house cafe, makeshift embassy,
Fuel for Ilyushin to speed on its way,
Moscow to Washington in the U.S.A.

Stand to attention as anthem is played,
The Soviet hymn is first to be made;
But the band had to let God save the Queen
For silence reigned where once the Russians had been.

Up and away went the Reds, so alert,
Time marching on so departure is pert.
The wind might be changing, the moon at the full?
And new Super Powers must always stay cool.

O the Right Hons. and the lady P.M.
May blush for accord given instant Amen.

B.E. BIGGS

The motivation for this poem came from a B.B.C. television broadcast of the Gorbachev-Thatcher "mini-summit" where, after the Soviet anthem had been played, the unseen commentator was heard to say, "They have not time to play the British national anthem." In the next news broadcast, this bit of gratis advice was omitted! We take it that it was the Russians who "had not the time" etc., although of course it may be that the Broadcasting House man meant to say the B.B.C. "had not the time" - which is still an affront.

David Irving's C H U R C H I L L ' S W A R

Shunned by all the 'establishment' publishers on account of its startling disclosures, this book shatters the 'orthodox' view of World War II as it examines the man who ruined Britain and the British Empire in his vendetta against Hitler's Germany.

Hard cover. Over 650 pages. Price £19.95 including postage.
Available from STEVEN BOOKS, P.O. BOX 112, LONDON N22 6AW.

WAR CRIMINALS

EVIDENTLY not satisfied with the long torment of the peace criminal Rudolf Hess, the Union of Jewish Students, aided and abetted by the "former" Communist and convicted housebreaker Gerry Gable, is mounting a campaign to "bring to [Soviet?] justice" alleged war criminals living in the United Kingdom. Mr Antanas Gecas has already been condemned without a hearing by this new inquisition.

Douglas Hurd has so far refused to send those who fled to Great Britain from Stalin's tyranny back to torture and a cruel death in the gulag, but now he is wavering, under pressure from concerted lobbying by minority groups and far left Labour MPs. Tony Marlow MP was right to warn, during a debate in which extremist elements suggested far-reaching and retrospective alterations to our laws to facilitate show-trials of anti-Communist fighters in British courts, that the Home Secretary should be wary on this matter "because supporters of this particular proposal are motivated not by justice, but by the demands of propaganda" (**The Times**, 4/12/87).

From War Criminal To Peer Of The Realm

Of course, Tory Action does not condone war crimes, whether committed by Germans, Russians, Japanese, or the man who assumed the alias of "the Earl of Stockton" while on the run, after being accused of procuring the massacre of refugees from Communism by Stalin and Tito in 1945. Odd, isn't it, that a German peace criminal should be sentenced to 46 years in the hell of Spandau, whilst a British war criminal became leader of the Conservative Party, Prime Minister and finally, to the parvenu's lasting delight, a peer of the realm?

As one Conservative MP (on the left of the Party!) put it in a letter to a Tory Action correspondent, dated 4th March, 1987: "There seem to be people in our society for whom the past is far more important than the future. Those who committed atrocities should indeed be punished but now, some forty-five years after the event, must be the time to draw a veil over the past."

Begin-ing Of Mid-East Terrorism

Still, if the UJS wants to talk about war criminals, let's talk about war criminals. One is Menachem Begin. Begin's psychotic racism is well illustrated by a broadcast that he made on Israeli Radio in which he said: "You Israelites! You should never become lenient when killing your enemies! You should have no pity on them, until we shall have destroyed their so-called Arab culture, on the ruins of which we shall build our own civilisation!"

Begin's crimes include the bombing of the King David Hotel in Jerusalem on 22nd July, 1946, in which 91 people including many British officers, Palestinian Arabs, and Jews were killed. Begin described 22nd July, 1946, as the proudest day of his life, surpassing even 10th July, 1948, the day of the massacre in the Arab village of Deir Yassin, during which 250 men, women and children were slaughtered by the hate-crazed killers of Begin's "Irgun". In the course of this vile atrocity, young girls were raped, the wombs of pregnant women were hacked open, and their unborn babies were impaled upon bayonets, and whole families were

blown up with hand grenades or shot down as they fled.

Another day in the life of Menachem Wolfowitsch Begin saw the slow-hanging with wire nooses of Sergeant Mervyn Paice, of Bristol, and Sergeant Clifford Martin, of Coventry. These two soldiers were serving in the security forces posted in Palestine to assist the Mandate Government, when they were kidnapped by the Irgun as hostages for the return of two terrorists who were among five who had been captured after a murderous attack on a British army installation at the fortress of Acre earlier in 1947, and who, after due process of law, had been condemned to the gallows.

Slow-Hanging With Wire

After Sergeant Paice and Sergeant Martin had been abducted from Nathanya on 12th July, 1947, Menachem Begin announced that if sentence was carried out against his two gunmen, then the two British hostages would be murdered. The two Irgun men were executed according to law, and Begin personally supervised the slow-hanging with wire of the two sergeants on 30th July, 1947.

The bodies of the two British soldiers were taken after their deaths to an eucalyptus grove near Nathanya and re-hanged. As **The Times** of 1st August, 1947, reported, the Irgun had placed a landmine between the two hanging bodies with the intention of murdering those who came to cut them down. One of the squad who came to recover their comrades' bodies for decent burial had his legs blown off by Begin's mine.

Menachem Begin was later awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. Perhaps because, like Nobel, he is an expert in the use of dynamite.

Reprinted, in abridged form, from the December 1987 issue of **Round Robin**, P.O. Box 850, London W14 8EN.

FROM OUR FAN-MAIL

Miss/Mrs/Ms Amanda Saunders, a public relations "person" with the Royal Overseas League (Patron: H.M. The Queen), wrote to our Editor asking to be removed from the mailing list. She said she found **Candour's** views "ignorant, prejudiced and dangerous". And that was having addressed our Editor as "Dear Rosine"! Well, well, dear Amanda. Did you know that your name is the Gerundive (Feminine, Nominative, Singular) of "amo, amare" (1st Conjugation), meaning "to be loved, worthy to be loved, lovable"? Yours is an eminently appropriate name for an official of the Royal Overseas League, which you say aims to "promote friendship between the peoples of the Commonwealth". We note the League's motto is "Ubique Navigavimus" - "We have voyaged everywhere". Yet you would have the League stop short of Forest House, as too dangerous by half!

CANDOUR SUBSCRIPTION RATES

U.K. £5.00 OVERSEAS £6.00 AIRMAIL U.S. $12 AIRMAIL PER ANNUM

Printed and published by Candour Publishing Company, Forest House, Liss Forest, Hampshire GU33 7DD, England (Editor: Rosine de Bounevialle)

CANDOUR ACTIVITIES BULLETIN

RULES OF ENGAGEMENT

ONE major success achieved by our nation's destroyers has been the undermining of our cherished right to express our views publicly. Yet a medium for free speech remains where it can be most easily heard, viz. radio phone-in programmes. This is an activity we can all engage in, with the minimum of exertion.

Step One

If you have never done it before, start simply on any topic about which you feel strongly. Find out the telephone number, name and phone-in times of your local radio station. You will discover this by ringing the station on the normal number and asking them if they have a phone-in and if so, what are the times and if there is a special number to ring. The time of day will very likely be in the morning when most people are at work, but some are in the evening.

Step Two

Listen in to the phopne-ins for some time to get used to how it is done. As the topics go along, see if you feel you could make some points better than those you hear until you get to wanting to phone-in yourself. The station may choose several topics or invite the public to choose their own. The station may also have a panel of "experts" to answer your questions.

Step Three

Choose a simple non-political topic with which to break the ice. Pick up the telephone, dial the number; someone will answer saying, "This is Viewpoint [or whatever]. What would you like to talk about?" Start with a simple subject such as the local by-pass or whatever local issue is in the news. Then the station will say, "And what would you like to say?" You will be asked for your name and telephone number, and the station operator will probably say, "Thank you. We will ring you back if we can fit you in. "In other words, they will pay for the conversation.

Step Four

If the telephone rings, the programme will be fed into your receiver, you will be asked if you can hear it all right and be reminded to make sure your own radio is not near the telephone. Then the programme operator will say something like, "You will be on next." You listen to the other caller talking on his topic through your telephone. Then the announcer will say, "Hello So-and-so, what would you like to say?" Away you go. First of all say good whatever-time-of-day-it-is and that you have never phoned-in before and you are nervous. That makes the programmers sympathetic because they depend on people phoning-in. Speak slowly and clearly and do not try to say too much. Be brief rather than too long. Write down a few pointers so that you don't dry up. Get plenty of practice so that the initial uncertainty disappears before you try anything more controversial.

Step Five - Hints for successful phone-ins

(a) Radio stations often have Left-wingers on these programmes so you may need to disguise your point of view on the subject in question by making your initial statement sound uncontroversial. This initial statement is addressed to the operator when you first phone in because this is when they decide whether to let you on the programme.

(b) If your subject is controversial and you wish to promote it, you may need to change your name and telephone number as we do not know the records they keep. You will discover this if your calls from your own number start to be ignored.

(c) Make written notes to have at hand so that skilful announcers have difficulty in diverting your train of thought.

(d) Concentrate hard on what you want to say before you go on and then use your wits to best advantage. You will be surprised how easy it becomes with practice.

(e) Always start on your local station because the national programmes are very hard to get on to.

(f) All radio stations operate a delay of five seconds between the time you speak and the time it is broadcast. This is for elimination of libel, obscenity and, possibly, uncomfortably Right views!

(g) Do record your own phone-in efforts on tape so that you can improve your performance.

Step Six - Acquiring information

Apart from your willingness to have a go, you need plenty of sound ammunition to reinforce your point of view. **Candour** provides it every month on the topics essential to the restoration of national sovereignty!

Step Seven - Results

Let us know how you do, particularly your successes. Remember - if you don't phone-in, no one will be influenced.

NEXT MONTH: Further information on how to provide yourself, and others, with ready ammunition!